

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Advisory Action mailed June 9, 2005. In order to advance prosecution of this Application, Claims 1, 11, and 17 have been amended. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this Application.

The Examiner issued a Final Action on March 18, 2005. Applicant submitted a Response to Examiner's Final Action on May 18, 2005. The Examiner issued an Advisory Action on June 9, 2005 stating that the Response to Examiner's Final Action would not be entered because it raised new issues requiring further searching and consideration. Applicant respectfully requests continued examination of this Application so that the Response to Examiner's Final Action be entered and considered by the Examiner pursuant to this Request for Continued Examination. For the convenience of the Examiner, the amendments made to the claims in the Response to Examiner's Final Action and the accompanying comments are repeated herein.

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter not described in the specification. Independent Claims 1, 11, and 17 have been amended to remove the language objected to by the Examiner. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-20 are in accordance with 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

Claims 1, 2, 4-15, and 17-19 stand rejected under 25 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Garnett, et al. Independent Claims 1, 11, and 17 have been amended to include all of the features of dependent Claims 5 and 6. Independent Claims 1, 11, and 17 recite in general the ability to couple a second processing device to a bus prior to decoupling from the bus a first processing device having access thereto. By

contrast, the Garnett, et al. patent does not provide any disclosure of an ability to have two processing devices coupled to a bus at the same time. Support for the above recitation can be found at page 7, lines 5-19, of Applicant's specification. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1, 2, 4-15, and 17-19 are not anticipated by the Garnett, et al. patent.

Claims 3, 16, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Garnett, et al. in view of PCI Local Bus Specification. Independent Claims 1, 11, and 17 from which Claims 3, 16, and 20 depend have been shown above to be patentably distinct from the Garnett, et al. patent. Moreover, the PCI Local Bus Specification does not include any additional material combinable with the Garnett, et al. patent that would be material to patentability of the claims. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 3, 16, and 20 are patentably distinct from the proposed Garnett, et al. - PCI Local Bus Specification.

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Amini, et al. in view of Trantanella. Independent Claims 1, 11, and 17 have been amended to include all features associated with dependent Claims 5 and 6, which includes the ability to couple a second processing device to the bus prior to decoupling from the bus a first processing device having access thereto. By contrast, the Amini, et al. and Trantanella patents both provide continuous connection of their respective devices and interface units to a common bus. Thus, neither the Amini, et al. patent nor the Trantanella patent are able to prevent their devices from providing a load on the bus as required in the claimed invention. The switches of the Trantanella patent are merely gated amplifiers that allow OUT signals to be placed on respective bus lines. The

gated amplifiers do not couple or decouple any devices to and from a bus. The in-out buffers are still continuously connected to the bus lines at all times and devices are still continuously coupled to the bus lines through the IN signal lines. Thus, there is no coupling of devices to or decoupling of devices from a bus in either the Amini, et al. or Trantanella patents as required by the claimed invention. Moreover, neither the Amini, et al. nor Trantanella patents can couple a second device to a bus prior to decoupling a first device from the bus having access thereto as required in the claimed invention. Support for the above recitation can be found at page 7, lines 5-19, of Applicant's specification. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-20 are patentably distinct from the proposed Amini, et al. - Trantanella combination.

Attached herewith is a check in an amount of \$790.00 made payable to the "Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks" to satisfy the request for continued examination fee of 37 C.F.R. §1.17(e).

CONCLUSION

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt to place the Application in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and full allowance of all pending claims.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any amount required or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

Attorneys for Applicant



Charles S. Fish

Reg. No. 35,870

June 20, 2005

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:

2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 600
Dallas, TX 75201-2980
(214) 953-6509
Customer Number: 05073